



## External Assessment Report 2010

Subject	<b>Travel and Tourism</b>
Level	<b>Intermediate 1</b>

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the Examination.

# Comments on candidate performance

## General comments

Very few candidates failed to complete the 2010 paper, and the marks ranged from 5% to 94%. Every question fulfilled its function as anticipated. The view was expressed that the paper, which was well written, was a good and appropriate challenge and allowed the more able candidates to display their knowledge in headroom questions.

There had been some changes in the cohort of candidates:

- ◆ The number of S5 candidates had increased and the numbers of S4, S6 and Further Education candidates had decreased.
- ◆ There were 20 new centres and nine returning centres.
- ◆ The number of candidates reached a new maximum of 864, which was an increase of 201 on last year's figure and an increase of 74 on the 2008 total which was the previous maximum.

Despite these minor changes, Travel and Tourism Intermediate 1 continues to enjoy a unique cohort which has a significant proportion of candidates of ability greater than Intermediate 1 level.

As is the norm for this examination, the cohort of candidates contained large proportions of S5, S6 and FE candidates. Each of these groups of candidates achieved a marks distribution which was skewed towards the higher end of the results percentages. A very high success rate is to be expected as long as this pattern of entries continues.

The markers made many positive comments about the standard of responses in the cohort. Comments ranged through 'Excellent', 'Very good' and 'Good', with the majority being of 'a high standard with very few of poor quality'. On the negative side, concern was expressed at some poor levels of literacy.

There was general agreement from all concerned in the marking exercise that this examination had performed its function well and that centres were preparing and instructing candidates to a high level in the necessary procedures, allowing them to be very successful in the examination.

## Areas in which candidates performed well

The markers felt that the quality of responses throughout the paper was generally of a very high level, with few exceptions.

Areas that were particularly well done were:

- ◆ Questions 3 and 4, parts (a) and (b) – the mapwork questions. Particular mention was given to Question 4 (c), the New York section
- ◆ Question 5b – the currency conversion

- ◆ Question 6 – there was evidence of candidates being well prepared for the social, economic and environmental impact of tourism

## **Areas which candidates found demanding**

Some questions clearly established ‘headroom’ and performed this role effectively: 1 (f), 1 (g)(ii), parts of 2 (a), 2 (c), and parts of 5 (d) and 6 (d).

Some candidates found the following areas difficult:

- ◆ Question 1 (i) – weaknesses distinguishing between rainfall and temperature
- ◆ Question 2 (a) – a number of minor errors and some arithmetic and calculator problems
- ◆ Questions 3 and 4, (a) and (b) – a minority group of candidates either did not use the atlas or had poor atlas reading skills
- ◆ Question 3 (c) – disappointing knowledge of British Isles tourist destination knowledge displayed by candidates
- ◆ Question 5 (a) – poor knowledge of areas within an airport
- ◆ Question 5 (d) – most candidates unable to give full answers. Many fail to grasp that the number of lines given for an answer should give an indication of how much writing is expected in an answer

## **Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates**

There is evidence that the candidates in this examination have, in general, been very well prepared throughout the session, and that teachers and tutors have spent a considerable amount of time on preparation for the examination. This is good practice and should be continued for future candidates.

However, again in 2010, there is evidence that a proportion of candidates find some topic areas to be unfamiliar. Areas affected by this include the full range of subject terminology, the booking form, and destination factfiles.

Some centres may benefit from additional work in the following areas:

- ◆ practice with completing booking forms with a variety of different layouts
- ◆ carefully calculating the different constituent parts of necessary holiday costs for the booking form
- ◆ further practice in identifying places on maps and correctly plotting places on maps – using an atlas
- ◆ practice of analysis of holiday problems to ensure all necessary pieces of information are supplied to enable a solution
- ◆ more time spent researching destinations at home and abroad and presenting this information in a concise format
- ◆ further training in the necessary subject terminology

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2009	673
Number of resulted entries in 2010	868

## Statistical information: performance of candidates

### Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum mark — 100				
A	46.1%	46.1%	400	70
B	24.0%	70.0%	208	60
C	16.4%	86.4%	142	50
D	2.8%	89.2%	24	45
No award	10.8%	100.0%	94	–

### General commentary on grade boundaries

While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary), it is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.

Each year, therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Head of Service and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions.

SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as Arrangements evolve and change.